DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 496 SP 010 019

AUTHOR Yarger, Sam J.; Mintz, Susan L.
TITLE A Post Hoc Analysis of Field Negotiated Content in a Two-Year Competency-Based Teacher Education Program.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Schools; *Field Experience Programs; *Internship Programs; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Performance Contracts; Preservice Education; Program Design; *Student Teaching; Teacher Education; Teaching Experience; Teaching Skills; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS *Syracuse Teacher Corps Program

ABSTRACT

At least four factors are important to consider in contemporary teacher education programs: the demand for increased accountability; the emphasis on field-based instruction; the need for responsiveness to field input; and the need for responsiveness to student input. In New York, the demand for increased accountability has been translated into a state requirement for the development of competency based teacher education programs. This paper describes the Syracuse Teacher Corps Project, which recruited 31 interns who had completed two years of undergraduate training, and provided teacher education that led to a bachelor's degree and an initial teaching certificate. The program is field based to the extent that the interns spent approximately half of their time on instructional teams in an inner city school setting. The other half of their commitment was directed toward the university courses necessary to complete their academic program. Competency agreements were negotiated between the preservice interns and either a field-based team leader or a field-based clinical instructor. (DMT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

SP
28.00

ED124496

A POST HOC ANALYSIS OF FIELD NEGOTIATED CONTENT IN A TWO-YEAR COMPETENCY-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SAM J. YARGER
SUSAN L. MINTZ
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

PRESENTED AT THE AMERICAN EDUCATION RESEARCH ASSOCIATION ANNUAL CONVENTION
SAN FRANCISCO
APRIL 1976

SP 010 019

An educational reader who happened to delve into the history of teacher training in America would find the reading fairly dull. Typically, preservice teachers complete two years of liberal arts study and are admitted to a teacher training program. Once enrolled, the prospective teacher encounters a fairly rigid series of prescribed courses. Though admittedly a simplified overview, this course of instruction commonly begins with study in what is generally referred to as the foundational areas, including the history, philosophy, sociology, and psychology of education. Subsequently, the fledgling teacher takes a series of methods courses in the content areas, i.e., reading, mathematics, social studies, science, and language arts. Finally, the student teaching experience concludes the teacher preparation program, with the student receiving a bachelor's degree and an initial teaching certificate. Secondary preservice teachers customarily trade in a few methods courses for a content emphasis in their teaching specialty.

As previously stated, that's history. Recently, things have begun to happen in teacher education and dramatic changes can be seen. At least four factors are important to consider in contemporary teacher education programs. Though not in any particular order, these include: 1) the demand for increased accountability; 2) the emphasis on field-based instruction; 3) the need for responsiveness to field input, and; 4) the need for responsiveness to student input.

In New York State, the demand for increased accountability has been translated into a State requirement for the development of competency-based teacher education programs. In the case of The Syracuse Teacher Corps Program that provided the data for this study, the demands of field based instruction have been translated into an internship in the schools. The State has required field input into program development in teacher education, and Teacher Corps has a history of encouraging program sensitivity to student input. Consequently, an analysis of the type of program about to be described

differs greatly from the brief historical description presented earlier.

The Syracuse Teacher Corps Project

The data for this study were gathered as a function of the Eighth Cycle Syracuse Teacher Corps program. Briefly, this program recruited students who had completed two years of undergraduate training, and provided a teacher education program that led to a bachelor's degree and an initial teaching certificate.

The program was field based to the extent that the interns spent approximately half of their time on an instructional team in a school setting. The other half of their commitment was directed toward the pursual of university courses necessary to complete their academic program.

The field-based involvement of the interns provided the basis for three hours credit each semester and three hours credit during the intervening summer. This fifteen-hour block of field-based instruction, approximately one-third of the student's professional training program, provided the data for this study. It is important to note that the campus-based part of the interns' program, both liberal arts and professional education, are not reflected in the data.

The unit of analysis in this study is the two-year program. The vehicle for analysis is the competency agreement,[1] A competency agreement is a negotiated contract involving the preservice intern and either a field-based team leader or a field-based clinical-instructor. All program personnel, along with the thirty-one interns, were trained in the process of developing competency statements and negotiating competency agreements. A competency agreement includes: 1) a rationale for competency selection; 2) a nonbehavioral statement

---

[1] Sam J. Yarger and Andrew Lebby, "The Writing and Rating of Competency Agreements," Syracuse University, Fall 1974. (Unpublished mimeograph.)

of competency; 3) precise objectives from which the competency can be inferred; 4) a statement of the situation under which the competency will be demonstrated; 5) indicators of competencies which specify the assessment tools; 6) a statement of the learning activities to be used in pursuit of competency development; 7) a description of the needed instructional support, and; 8) an estimate of the time involved. Competency agreements were viewed as total units, thus not allowing for disjointed approaches to an individual's program.

Prior to the training, the program participants were informed that the process was designed so that each individual intern's program could reflect specific needs both in terms of the intern and in terms of the school setting. No requirements were made of field personnel in regard to the content of the competency agreement. Indeed, it was explained that this process was a programmatic attempt to be responsive to field input, to be responsive to the needs of students, as well as to allow for an independent and personalized approach to teacher education.

University personnel in the program did, however, provide competency-based field materials that could be easily translated into competency agreements. This was done in an effort to provide content for competency agreements when desired, particularly at the onset. Also, it did meet the requirement that university program personnel were obligated to, in fact, conceptualize and plan the program. It was emphasized, however, that there was no intent to view these competency modules as anything but a single source of possible options.

University professors themselves did not negotiate competency agreements. These were negotiated between interns and field personnel. University personnel did, however, serve as instructional resources and as instructors upon demand when competency agreements so required. In some cases, interns negotiated common or group agreements, and mini-courses of varying types were taught by university personnel.

The primary role of the university program personnel was that of bookkeeper for the program. All negotiated competency agreements were submitted to university offices and a complete record was kept of each intern's progress. Virtually no rejection of competency agreements was performed by university personnel. It was thought that this strategy would create a quicker and more widespread acceptance of the competency agreement process, as well as provide richer information concerning field perceived needs of preservice teachers.

School Environment and Subjects

The data for this study reflect the perceived training needs of preservice teachers at four inner-city elementary schools in Syracuse, New York. The students in the schools are considered to be from a lower and working-class socioeconomic population. The schools are mixed racially, with a predominance of black children, a minority of white children, and a very limited number of Spanish-speaking children.

The thirty-one Teacher Corps interns were distributed in the schools on instructional teams that consisted of 5 or 6 interns, 1 team leader, and 2 to 4 cooperating teachers. The 31 Teacher Corps interns consisted of 23 females: 12 black, 10 white and 1 Oriental; plus 8 males: 6 black and 2 white. The five team leaders, selected because of their perceived competence as classroom teachers, consisted of 3 white males and 2 black females. The two clinical field instructors, who were university employed but exclusively field-based, consisted of two white females.

The interns selected for the Syracuse Teacher Corps Project were chosen on the basis of 1) stated commitment to inner-city teaching through Teacher Corps application; 2) a complex programmatic screening process involving group interviews, and; 3) ethnic and sex distribution concerns (although the emphasis was on recruiting males rather than females). Traditional academic requirements of the university were not employed, though the screening committee

sometimes used these data as part of the total decision-making process. The mean entrance grade point average for the thirty-one interns was 2.35 (on a 4.0 scale). The individual grade point averages ranged from 1.72 to 3.80, with a standard deviation of .425. It should be noted that the mean grade point average of the incoming interns was approximately .15 below the minimal acceptable grade point average (2.5) for admission to the university's traditional teacher education program.

Data Collection and Analysis

The basic data for this study, 642 negotiated competency agreements, were collected between September 1, 1973 and May 30, 1975. The mean number of competency agreements per intern was 20.77, with a low of 13 and a high of 31.

Other data were also used for purposes of analysis. These data were programmatically generated and were not obtained specifically for purposes of this study. However, their availability rendered them usable. These data include the interns' grade point average, both for education as well as noneducation courses, and the Watson-Glazer Critical Thinking Appraisal. Personological data such as age, race and sex were also available.

Definitions

The data were analyzed along two dimensions that required interpretation, and therefore the training of coders, plus three dimensions that required only clerical transcription. The two dimensions requiring interpretation were labeled "Competency Area" and "Professional Intensity" while the three requiring clerical transcription were entitled "Role of Negotiator," "Source and Individuality of Agreement," and "Program Phase." The definitions of these basic dimensions constitute the analytical vehicles for this study.

- Competency Areas

Competency areas are seen as the basic professional training areas that comprise the totality of the field-based training program.

Content.--Content competency agreements are designed for the development of some knowledge base. They require no interaction with children and no demonstration of any instructional skill. A Content competency agreement may be developed in reference to a discipline, or may be developed in a pedagogical and/or interpersonal domain. The key criterion is that it relates only to knowing about something, not acting on that knowledge within the teaching role. Examples include learning conversational Spanish, a review of three science programs, and the operation of audiovisual equipment.

Interpersonal.--Interpersonal competency agreements were designed to aid the preservice student in developing skills in relating to others, either children or adults. They are distinguished from Content competency agreements in that they go beyond learning about interpersonal skills and relate to the noninstructional use of that information. They are distinct from either Behavioral Management or Instructional Planning of Management categories in that they do not require the use of the skills within the classroom.

Behavioral Management.--A Behavioral Management competency agreement is designed to develop the preservice student's ability to manage a classroom environment or the behavior of children within the classroom. Although it has purpose

(objectives, goals, etc.), it does not relate to instruction. Rather, Behavioral Management competency agreements focus on such things as discipline, spatial arrangements, the noninstructional placement of children, and processes that are interpersonal yet noninstructional in nature, e.g., classroom rules, classroom meetings.

Instructional Planning and Management.--Instructional Planning agreements include those that are intended to teach preservice students how to plan and/or prepare for instruction. Instructional Management includes those agreements which instruct the student in either a specific method or a more general instructionally related management technique. Agreements falling within this category go beyond knowledge and content and require either instructional planning, or actual interaction and instructional procedures with children.

Integrative.--An Integrative competency agreement is one that calls upon the preservice student to "put together" various components in a meaningful way. It may require that the student implement a total program for an extended period of time, or it may require that the student focus on the maintenance of two or more activities simultaneously. It goes beyond either of the management categories but may utilize elements of both. In short, it is an upward extension of either management category and focuses on requiring the preservice student to function more like a "regular teacher."

- Professional Intensity

Professional Intensity refers to the level of professional involvement necessary to successfully complete the competency agreements. The more involvement necessary the more the preservice student will be acting like a "regular teacher."

Preparatory.--This category includes those agreements which prepare a preservice teacher for an active teaching role, through traditional study. It may utilize teaching materials and the observation of teachers and/or students. Though the activity is logically linked to preparing for actual instructional involvement with children, no involvement is required.

Initial Interactive.--An Initial Interactive competency agreement requires the preservice student to interact with children and/or with parents in an instructional setting. There are limitations on the involvement, however, since the student does not accept total and/or extended instructional responsibility. The activity is short range and usually unidimensional in nature. In may demand supervision of a cooperating teacher.

Advanced Interactive.--Advanced Interactive competency agreements require the preservice students to teach for a longer period of time (one-half day or more), and assume the responsibility of the classroom. These responsibilities are likely to be more multi-dimensional in nature than those which fall in the Initial Interactive category. It suggests that the preservice student is able to behave in a more integrated fashion, like an experienced teacher.

- Role of Competency Agreement Negotiator

School-Based University Personnel.--This category refers to those individuals who were called "Clinical Field Instructors." They operated exclusively within the field, though were employed by the university. Their role was the negotiation of competency agreements with regards to the school needs of the preservice interns rather than needs that might have been expressed by university personnel. The primary concern of the school-based university personnel focused on the development of the student's skills in the classroom where they were assigned.

School Personnel.--School personnel refers to those individuals who worked with interns as employees of the city school districts. Typically this role was fulfilled by a team leader, though on occasion other instructional personnel became involved.

- Source and Individuality of Competency Agreements

Program Generated/Shared.--Competency agreements falling in this category are those prepared by university program personnel in isolation from interns and offered to interns as options. They were negotiated by a single intern or a group of interns. If the agreement was negotiated by a single intern, that competency agreement must have been utilized by at least one other intern to be included in this category.

Field Generated/Shared.--This category includes those competency agreements developed in the field by the interns and field-based personnel. They may have been negotiated by either an intern or a group of interns. If the agreement was negotiated by a single intern, the agreement must have been utilized by at least one other intern.

Unique.--A Unique competency agreement is one that was negotiated by an individual intern for his or her own personal use. There are no other competency agreements identical to this one.

- Program Phase

For analytical purposes, the program was broken into five separate phases.

Semester I.--September 1, 1973 through December 30, 1973.
Semester II.--January 1, 1974 through May 30, 1974.
Intervening Summer.--June 1, 1974 through August 31, 1974.
Semester III.--September 1, 1974 through December 31, 1974.
Semester IV.--January 1, 1975 through May 30, 1975.

Training of Coders

Two undergraduate students at Syracuse University were employed for purposes of interpreting the competency agreements in terms of the coding categories. Training of the coders took place in two sessions of approximately three hours each. Subsequent to the study of operational definitions of the coding categories, the students attempted to interpret the competency agreements in small groups of ten, selected in an unsystematic fashion. When the coders had reached proficiency so that they could achieve 80 per cent or more agreement on three consecutive groups of ten, coding for the purpose of analysis

was begun. Those competency agreements used for training purposes were then returned to the total group.

The interpretation of the competency agreements required approximately twenty hours on five separate occasions. Both students coded all of the agreements. In the Competency Area dimension, the coders achieved 93 per cent agreement on all categories. Those instances where disagreement did occur were discussed and agreement was reached with the help of a research assistant. The same process was utilized for Professional Intensity, with a 91 per cent agreement with all competency agreements and the disagreements were negotiated. In the three categories requiring only clerical transcription, there were better than 99 per cent agreement, and when errors were found, they were the result of clerical mistranscription.

Analysis of Data

The data were first cast in a descriptive mode. Subsequently, the descriptive statistics were analyzed and questions were generated. These questions were then proposed in a statistical framework. The resultant data are post hoc in nature and presented for the better understanding of the important aspects of this study.

Findings

The basic findings will be presented in a mode that describes the two-year program in terms related to negotiated competency agreements. Additionally, data will be presented that focus on comparisons of the basic data with other available programmatic information.

Table 1 presents the distribution of the total number of competency agreements over the entire program. The distribution appears to be unspectacular with the exception of the third semester, when a significant drop in the number of initiated competency agreements occurred. At least two possible explanations exist for this phenomenon. First, the third semester began directly on the heels

Table 1

Distribution of Competency Agreements by Semester

	Semester of Program										Total	
	First		Second		Summer		Third		Fourth			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Competency Agreements	136	21.2	167	26.0	138	21.5	35	5.5	166	25.8	642	100

of the only vacation the interns had during the two-year experience. It is possible that after being away from the rigors of a very involved program, there was some difficulty experienced in reorienting themselves to the task at hand. Second, and the data are not complete enough to verify this, it is possible that there were many uncompleted competency agreements negotiated earlier in the program; thus the interns could have seen this as the appropriate period to finish uncompleted tasks before initiating new ones.

Table 2 presents the negotiated agreements by competency area. Several interesting findings emerge. First, it is important to note the very low number of Integrative competency agreements. Although the students were all required to teach for extended periods of times prior to graduation, it appears that in preparation for this assignment, there was little need perceived to develop specific training procedures. It is possible that field personnel expected, erroneously or otherwise, that second year interns could "put it together" without the benefit of specific training.

Contrary to the writer's suspicions, there was also a paucity of Interpersonal competency agreements. It is possible that both students and field personnel perceived this to be an area where it was difficult to negotiate an agreement within the prescribed guidelines. In other words, the activities associated with Interpersonal competency agreement may well have occurred at a higher rate than is reflected in these data.

It appears that learning about things (content) was not perceived as a high priority need. It may be that field personnel believed that area to be the domain of the university, or it may be that in light of the highly interactive nature of the field-based program, that content needs were simply overlooked. A more frightening possibility is that the heavy emphasis on interaction with children in a field-based program simply blotted out the important need for knowledge and understanding. It should be noted, however, that such an analysis clearly goes beyond the available information.

Table 2

Competency Area of Competency Agreements by Semester

	Semester of Program										Totals	
	First		Second		Summer		Third		Fourth			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Content	9	1.4	29	4.5	19	2.9	1	.15	25	3.9	83	12.85
Interpersonal	0	0	1	.2	10	1.6	0	0	1	.2	12	2.0
Behavioral Management	46	7.2	61	9.5	12	1.9	9	1.4	32	5.0	160	25.0
Instructional Planning and Management	81	12.6	76	11.8	91	14.15	25	3.9	108	16.8	381	59.25
Integrative	0	0	0	0	6	.9	0	0	0	0	6	.9

Behavioral Management and Instructional Planning and Management constitute the bulk of the competency agreements (nearly 85 per cent), with Instructional Planning and Management doubling that of Behavioral Management. One observation is that while Behavioral Management competency agreements tended to decrease as the program progressed, Instructional Planning Management competencies tended to increase. This would appear to be consistent with an analysis of how a field-based teacher education program ought to proceed. In other words, it is reasonable to assume that as preservice teacher education students become more skillful in dealing with the behavioral management of students, then they can better focus their skills on planning and implementing instructional procedures.

Table 3 presents the data concerning the Professional Intensity of the competency agreements. The Advanced Interactive category is similar to the Integrative category in the previous description, with the exception that the Advanced Interactive category required students to spend larger blocks of time in the instructional process. It would appear, however, that the coding conventions were not sufficiently detailed to separate Integrative from Advanced Interactive, or that there was little if any difference. Regardless, both categories picked up the same competency agreements.

There is no marked shift from Preparatory to Initial Interactive as the program progressed. One would expect that field-based teacher education students would spend less time involved in developing skills that are classified as prerequisites to teaching and more time in developing actual teaching skills as they proceed through a two-year program. Such was not the case.

Because the competency agreement process was developed in an effort to allow for a greater control by an intern of his/her field experience, as well as to provide an opportunity for more individuality, the data concerning the source and individuality of competency agreements were examined (Table 4). Nearly half (42.8 per cent) of the competency agreements were written from materials provided by the university faculty. This occurred with absolutely

Table 3

Professional Intensity of Competency Agreements by Semester

	Semester of Program										Totals	
	First		Second		Summer		Third		Fourth			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Preparatory	40	6.2	84	13.1	98	15.3	15	2.3	70	10.9	307	47.8
Initial Interactive	96	15.0	83	12.9	33	5.1	20	3.1	95	14.8	327	50.9
Advanced Interactive	0	0	0	0	7	1.1	0	0	1	.2	8	1.3

Table 4

Source and Individuality of Competency Agreements by Semester

	Semester of Program										Totals	
	First		Second		Summer		Third		Fourth			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Program Generated/Shared	79	12.3	92	14.3	29	4.5	9	1.4	66	10.3	275	42.8
Field Generated/ Shared	46	7.2	57	8.9	97	15.1	21	3.3	76	11.85	297	46.3
Unique	11	1.7	18	2.8	12	1.9	5	.8	24	3.75	70	10.9

no expectation of its occurrence by university program personnel. There was a slight tendency for more field-generated competency agreements to occur as the program proceeded, although this trend was not great. Finally, only 70 out of 642 (10.9 per cent) competency agreements were unique, that is, one of a kind. It can be argued that shared competency agreements are programmatically efficient, though that claim is not made. Yet, the fact remains that individualization in its pure form did not occur at a high rate.

Table 5 presents the data concerning the role of the negotiator in the competency agreement process. Nearly 80 per cent of the competency agreements were negotiated by school district personnel. Usually, this was the Teacher Corps team leader, though on some occasions other school personnel such as cooperating teachers became involved. It was not unusual for this to have occurred, as school personnel were primarily responsible for the interns' field-based experience. Additionally, the school is where the intern spent the greatest amount of time. Also, there is a noticeable shift from school-based university personnel to school district personnel as the program progressed. In other words, more and more of the responsibility for development of the preservice teachers program, at least that portion that was field-based, was assumed by school personnel. Parenthetically, it appeared to program personnel that as the semesters went by, school personnel became more interested in the interns' university program, and were more willing to provide support to university personnel in working with an intern who was having difficulty. All in all, this was considered to be one of the most positive results of the entire endeavor.

The Instructional Planning and Management category was analyzed for children's subject matter content. This particular category was selected because it was the only category where it would have been logical for the intern to focus on the development of instructional skills in a given subject matter area. These results are presented in Table 6.

Table 5

Negotiator of Competency Agreements by Semester

	Semester of Program										Totals	
	First		Second		Summer		Third		Fourth			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
School Based University Personnel	66	10.3	41	6.4	17	2.6	2	.3	8	1.3	134	20.9
School District Personnel	70	10.9	126	19.6	121	18.8	33	5.2	158	24.6	508	79.1

Table 6

Subject Matter of Instructional Planning and Management Category Competency Agreements by Semester

		Semester of Program										Totals	
		First		Second		Summer		Third		Fourth			
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Subject Matter Area	Reading	20.5	5.39	9	2.37	7.5	1.97	9	2.37	28	7.4	74	19.5
	Math	3	.79	8.5	2.24	7.5	1.97	6	1.58	19.5	5.13	44.5	11.7
	Social Studies	6	1.58	7	1.84	4	1.05	1	.26	4	1.05	22	5.8
	Science	4	1.10	3	.79	4	1.05	2	.52	14	3.68	27	7.1
	Language Arts	4.5	1.18	3.5	.92	1	.26	0	0	9.5	2.5	18.5	3.2
	Other	2	.52	1	.26	3	.79	1	.26	5	1.32	12	3.2
	No Subject Matter or Can't Tell	41	10.79	41	10.79	62	16.32	6	1.58	32	8.42	182	47.9

The most notable finding is that nearly one-half (47.9 per cent) of the competency agreements in the Instructional Planning and Management category had either no subject matter focus or the coders couldn't discern whether or not there was one. It would be an unwarranted extension of the data to suggest that these were all "process" competency agreements, yet there can be little doubt that a great number of them fell into that category. Additionally, many of the agreements in this area focused on the development of a skill (e.g., developing lesson plans) where the intern was given his/her selection of the subject matter, and it was never specified. In these instances, the criteria for successful completion of the competency agreements were not subject matter area imbedded.

The other data appear to be as one might expect. The greatest bulk of subject matter competency agreements was in the reading and math areas, with science and social studies trailing. Where subject matter could be discerned, only twelve competency agreements (3.2 per cent) fell into subject matter areas outside those listed. This may have been the result of the strong emphasis in inner-city schools on basic skills for children.

Additional Analysis Using Personological Data

In an effort to gain a richer understanding of the competency agreement dimension of the Eighth Cycle Syracuse Teacher Corps Program, it was decided to compare the competency agreement data with other information. The process by which this occurred is relatively simple, and probably as yet incomplete. The writers simply gathered the other data that were available and, after studying the descriptive information presented earlier, posed questions that fell within the scope of both sets. Although the questions were not totally capricious, they do reflect hunches and observations held by program personnel who spent two years working with the project. Certainly, there are other questions that could be posed, and other analyses

that could be made. No claim is made that the following analyses represent either a comprehensive picture, or even a wise selection.

Grade Point Average

For purposes of analysis, the interns' transcripts were analyzed for both education and noneducation grade point average. The mean education grade point average was 3.56 while the mean noneducation grade point was 2.35. The standard deviation for the education grade point average was .25 while for the noneducation grade point average it was .42. The low standard deviation of the education grade point average rendered it less than helpful as an analytical tool. Because the Pearson-Product-Moment Correlation is sensitive to variance, and because the education grade point average had such a limited variance, it could not be used profitably for purposes of analysis. Also, by ranking the education grade point averages, one blotted out the limited variance and ascribed a great deal of importance to grade point differences as low as .03. Consequently, only analyses or comparisons performed with the noneducation grade point average will be cited. The noneducation grade point average is essentially presage information, though there were some noneducation courses taken by the interns once entered in the program.

The question was asked whether or not students with higher noneducation grade point averages would complete more competency agreements than those with lower grade point averages. A rho correlation of .393 obtained ($.01 > p > .001$).

Also, the question was asked whether grade point average could be used to predict the number of unique competency agreements students might perform, or the "program phase" that competency agreements might be initiated. (NOTE: For program phase analyses, the program was broken into two phases. The first phase included the first and second semester plus the summer, and the second phase included the third and fourth semester). A chi square was used to test this question, with very limited results. There was no significance

when comparing education grade point averages with the proportion of unique competency agreements negotiated nor when comparing noneducation grade point average with the program phase that competency agreements were negotiated. The comparison of educational grade point average with program phase yielded a chi square of 4.7 ($.2 > p > .1$, $df = 3$).

Age

When comparing competency agreements with intern age, several findings emerged. Age was positively related to the number of competency agreements completed ($r_s = .312$, $.05 > p > .02$). Also, when the comparison was made of age with program phase, it was discovered that older students tended to complete more competency agreements in the first phase of the program, while younger interns tended to complete more competency agreements toward the end of the program ($\chi^2 = 8.172$, $.05 > p > .02$, $df = 3$). There was also a tendency for age to distinguish between the interns' selection of content of competency agreements. Older interns tended to negotiate less competency agreements in the Behavioral Management/Instructional Planning and Management area than did younger interns, with the most limited selection in the area of Instructional Planning and Management ($\chi^2 = 6.667$, $.1 > p > .05$, $df = 3$).

Race

Because the children in the target schools were predominantly black, the question was asked as to whether black interns would have a tendency to become more interactively involved with children than would white interns. A chi square yielded nonsignificant results, as did the chi square comparing race with total number of competency agreements negotiated.

Sex

The only analysis by sex was related to the question of whether male or female interns would negotiate a larger number of competency agreements. The chi square relating to this question was nonsignificant.

Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal

Several questions were asked related to the results of the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal, with little information generated. Using chi square, it was found that there was a tendency for students who scored higher on the Watson-Glaser to complete more competency agreements during earlier phases of the program ($\chi^2 = 6.103$; $.2 > p > .1$, $df = 3$). Comparisons attempting to utilize the Watson-Glaser scores in relation to the number of competency agreements done, the interactive nature of competency agreements, and the number of unique competency agreements performed were all nonsignificant.

These data cannot be overgeneralized, yet they do suggest that noneducation grade point average as well as age can be predictive of certain types of program achievements.

Discussion

Any study that is post-hoc in nature, and limited to an analysis of information that was generated for programmatic purposes, must suffer the vagaries of incomplete information as well as glaring data holes. This study is no exception. However, within the tradeoff, one obtains information that is directly related to an ongoing program, and is directly related to that which is feasible and that which is real. Again, this study is no exception.

Within the above context, certain findings appear worthy of highlighting. These include:

1. The program encountered an extended "down time" as evidenced by the marked drop in competency agreements negotiated during the third semester. This drop was unnoticed by program personnel.

2. Interns did not negotiate many competency agreements in either the Integrative or Advanced Interactive categories.

3. There was a marked shift over time from negotiation of Behavioral Management to Instructional Planning and Management competency agreements.

4. There was a very limited number of Unique competency agreements negotiated.

5. There was a marked shift over time from agreements negotiated with university personnel to agreements negotiated with school-based personnel.

6. There were few competency agreements relating to the development of skills in children's subject matter content.

7. Age and noneducation grade point average were related to the amount of work completed as well as the rate at which the work was performed.

This was a unique and specialized program, as most Teacher Corps programs are. The students were specially selected and not representative of the teacher education students at Syracuse University. The schools were carefully selected and represented predominantly poor and minority community. The field-based component of the program was one-half time over two years. Consequently, one must be very cautious in generalizing from these type of data. These constraints notwithstanding, there appears to be at least a glimmer of implications for program developers in teacher education.

First, it may be that teacher education programmers assume that students can integrate many discordant components and adopt an integrated teaching style without specific training in that process. Teacher education programs appear to have directed little effort toward developing the skills necessary for assuming total classroom responsibility. In this study, that fact was glaringly evident.

Second, it appears that program developers should become more sensitive to the sequencing of program components. This study suggests that teacher education students perceive skills in Behavioral Management to be precursors to skills in Instructional Planning and Management. Although this is consistent with a good deal of conventional wisdom evident for many years, there is some question as to how well it fits the sequenee of most teacher education programs. Undoubtedly there are other sequencing issues, not evident in this study, that program developers should seek out and develop a sensitivity towards.

Third, it appears that individualization of program is not synonymous with individual uniqueness of program. If one assumes that in this study field personnel selected the content of the competency agreements in relation to perceived needs of both the schools and the students, then the limited number of unique competency agreements generated suggests that individualization can occur with a great deal of commonality. Again, this probably represents a "common sense" approach to program development, but at the same time appears to contradict a lot of the current thoughts concerning individualization and personalization of teacher education programs.

Fourth, and one of the more important implications of this study, is that school district employees are willing to assume responsibility for teacher education. However, teacher education programmers must be sensitive to the fact that a good deal of material and support from the university is still required. It may be that although school district personnel want to become increasingly involved in the teacher training effort, they do not want to assume sole responsibility.

A fifth implication for program development suggests that planners should be sensitive to the danger of blotting out subject matter content in the development of competencies and skills. It might be that the intense involvement with reality simply mitigates against the development of instructional skills in subject matter areas. Regardless of reason, field-based program developers probably ought to take steps necessary to ensure that areas such as Behavioral Management do not operate at the expense of learning how to teach subjects to children.

Finally, this study offers minimal support for the maintenance of some of the traditional predictors of student success. It has been known for some time that grade point average predicts success on university campuses, but this study suggests that the entering grade point average might also be a fairly good predictor of not only the amount of work a student will do in a field-based environment, but also the rate at which a student will work. Although idiosyncratic to this study in that there were a greater number of older students, one suspects that a question ought to be raised concerning the age (and implied maturity) of a student entering a teacher education program. It is possible that in traditional teacher education programs, we enter students too young.

In conclusion, this study may well raise more questions than it answers, but perhaps good post hoc field analyses are meant to do that. Beyond the analysis of these data, the writers would suggest that research be initiated which attempts to relate the campus component of a teacher education program to that which occurs in the field. Although not dealt with in this study, the suspicion clearly exists that the linkages are scanty and the relationship too limited.

The question also looms as to whether students who complete programs such as Teacher Corps with an intense and extended field-based component are, in fact, different from students in a more traditional program. The movement toward field-based teacher preparation has been based on the implicit assumption that more field involvement is not only different, but also better. Both assumptions are

open to question. Is, in fact, a field-based program likely to produce teachers with different skills than a campus-based program? And more important, are teacher education students involved in programs with a heavy field-based component, in fact, more effective teachers upon completion of the program? A corollary question asks whether the program is more or less efficient than traditional programs, as it is well known that they are more costly and more demanding of professional time and effort.